

THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, JUNE 27, 1850.

TO NOSE BUT OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

This is the last number of the first half of the fourth volume of the *Era*. Our subscribers, whose terms expire with this number, will, we are sure, be prompt in renewing; and, so far as the hot weather may allow, exert themselves to furnish us with new readers. Five dollars, they will recollect, will renew their own subscription and pay for two new subscribers.

We have been so crowded since the commencement of the present session of Congress, with reports of debates and speeches, that variety in our columns was impossible, and no room was spared for the accommodation of our contributors. But everything has an end, and Congress can be no exception to the rule. It will adjourn, we presume, some time in August, and then we hope to be able to distribute some of the treasures we have been laying up for so many months. Much larger space will be devoted to our Literary Miscellany.

Three numbers more will close the story of the Mother-in-Law. To the remaining portion of the *Era*, we have assigned the subject of the Convention among the contributors, Grace Greenwood, Martha Russell, Mary Irving, Mrs. H. B. Shaw, Henry B. Stanton, and C. H. Wiley of North Carolina, a new correspondent.

It is with unalloyed satisfaction we inform our readers that the gifted Grace Greenwood is to be a permanent contributor to the *Era*.

We have on hand a series of most agreeable sketches from the pen of Martha Russell, entitled "Sketches of our Village," presenting very lively delineations of the social life of New England.

We hope, too, for something more from the genius of Nathaniel Hawthorne, who some time since favored us with one of the most admirable allegorical sketches in the English language.

To the consideration of the great question which agitates so deeply the public mind, and is destined for a long time to come to fill the hearts and thoughts of the people, we shall devote whatever energies we may possess.

Come, then, friends; let us have the benefit of your continued association and cooperation, and let us widen our circle of readers.

PERSONALITIES.

The Senate of the United States, once famed for its decorum, is becoming rather notorious for its intemperance of irreconcilable personalities. Nothing is more common in its proceedings, than to substitute a question of consistency for one of principle, a personal for a logical issue. If an argument cannot be answered, the motives of the man who uses it may be impugned. Opposition to a measure, especially if the latter be the offspring of the Slave-Interest, is often attempted to be put down by derision and contempt. The assaults of an abuse are favored with general lectures on demagoguery; and to manifest a strong anti-slavery feeling is to give evidence of fanaticism or pharisaical sanctity.

We said once before, and we repeat, that the Senate, for these violations of its decorum, is more censurable than the individual culprits. The debater, sometimes blinded by his intemperance, unless checked by those who are listening calmly and with a critical ear, is hurried into expressions from which he would shrink, could he but think twice before speaking once. But, we have observed that the carelessness of that body to maintain its rules of order depends very much on the position and character of the actors in these personal conflicts. If the assailant holds opinions popular in the Senate, and the assailed is generally obnoxious on account of his position, the dignity of the body winks at the assault, but is shocked at the defence. Mr. Benton well remarked: "Everybody is in order but me. It is in order for everybody to attack me on all hands." Mr. Webster was a gratified listener of Mr. Dawson, when that gentleman made his onslaught on Mr. Hale, reading from private letters with a view to impeach his integrity; but, he was exceedingly pained at the disorder growing out of the reading of private letters in a scene between Clay and Benton—indeed, hereafter he should feel bound to call gentlemen to order for such things! It would be well for him and some others to remember, that the dignity of the Senate is best vindicated by the impartiality with which its rules are enforced.

While on this subject of personalities, we are reminded of the fact that the demeanor of members of Congress towards each other depends greatly upon the state of sentiment in their respective localities respecting the mode of settling personal controversies. And here, we must remark that members from the free States labor under some disadvantage in their political intercourse with their brethren from the South. In the former section, the code of honor, as it is styled, is obsolete; in the latter, it is of binding force. In the former, for the settlement of personal controversies, Reason asserts its supremacy over Brute Force, and so strongly does public sentiment reprobate resort to the duello, that the duellist risks his reputation and his liberty, and is quite sure to exclude himself from the hope of political preferment. In the latter, public sentiment sanctions the practice of duelling, and the man who declines to vindicate his honor by the explosion of gunpowder, is voted unfit for public station. The result is, that we find in Congress two classes of members—duellists, coming from the South, men of peace, coming from the North. The bearing of members towards each other is determined to a great extent by this fact. Northern men are not apt to indulge in invective against Southern men, for they are sure to run the risk of an insult which the sentiments of their constituencies forbid them to resent according to the so-called "code of honor." Southern members, while treating each other as general rule, with marked courtesy, studiously avoiding expressions that may lead to personal conflict, exhibit a different demeanor in their intercourse with their Northern associates. In cases of differences of opinion with them, they are apt to be overbearing, arrogant, contemptuous; they are guilty of personalities which are watchfully guarded against in their intercourse with each other. The reason is obvious: they are emboldened by impunity; they are aware that public sentiment at the North forbids a man taking deliberate and bloody vengeance for an insult. To abuse a Northern member is a cheap and safe mode of displaying their valor—one of their modes of establishing their claim to dominion.

Of course, our remarks have a general significance. There are a few Southern men who repudiate the laws of honor, as they are called—a few Northern men who recognize them. There are a few Southern men, too, who are always courteous, whatever may be the party with whom they are drawn into conflict; and a few Northern members whose peculiar position or distinction exempts them from abuse from any quarter. But the general truth of the difference we have pointed out, must be admitted by all who are familiar with the proceedings of Congress. We have no doubt, then, on this question of slavery, many Northern men are restrained from more frequent and earnest expression of their opinions by the dread of the vituperation to which it may expose them—vituperation which their principles, their education, and the public sentiment of the section they represent, will prevent them from resenting in the only way effectual with Southern duellists. The truth is, if any consideration under heaven could overcome our conscientious abhorrence of the bloody code of duelling, it would be that of the gross abuse to which members of Congress from the free States are continually subjected, on account of their known rejection of this code.

We submit now to Southern men—it is honorable to insult a man because it is safe to do so? Is it any evidence of courage, of magnanimity, of chivalry? We enter no plea for men who are themselves transgressors of the proprieties of debate. The man who throws stones may expect to be stoned. He who indulges in abuse of another, and then takes shelter under a profession of peace-principles, is just as contemptible as he who gratuitously wounds the feelings of one who, he knows, is restrained from calling him to an account. But, a difference of opinion is no just cause of offence. No matter what views a member may utter, no matter how repugnant to the sentiments or interests of others, no matter with what pertinacity, boldness, and independence he may insist upon them, so long as he maintains the decorum of debate, denouncing no man for dissent, questioning the motives of no one, it is a violation of the freedom of debate, of the order of a legislative body, it is repugnant to common sense and ordinary courtesy, to attempt to put him down by vituperative invective, and, if he be known to be a man of peace, opposed to the code of honor so-called, such invective is as mean and cowardly as it is unreasonable and disorderly.

ADDRESS OF THE NASHVILLE CONVENTION.

Our columns are too crowded at present by Congressional matter, to allow us to publish the Address of the Nashville Convention. Our readers will be reminded to this by our conversation that the Convention was not a fair representation of the slaveholding States, and had no authority to speak for them. Its opinions and acts must be regarded as those of a few restless politicians, dissatisfied with the existing relations between the two sections of the country, but without a clear understanding of what they themselves want.

We must, however, present a general view of the Address.

It commences with a survey of the agitation of the Slavery Question for the last sixteen years. Before this period, the Northern people gave no just cause of offence to the South; but sixteen years ago, slavery began to be agitated in Congress and assailed by "our sister States." The means of agitation first resorted to was, petitioning; the object being the abolition of Slavery in the South, although the memorials were confined in terms to the removal of the institution from the District of Columbia and Territories, and the abolition of the internal slave trade. To meet this evil, a resolution, sustained by a large majority, was adopted, to the effect, that, on December, 1844, it fell before the unanimous vote of the North, and thus the unlimited power of introducing and considering the subject of slavery in Congress was asserted.

But agitation in Congress was not the only grievance. Anti-slavery publications were issued at the North, anti-slavery lectures were employed, organizations were got up for running off slaves, almost every Northern Legislature passed laws designed to baffle the constitutional provision for the recapture of fugitives.

The result was, universal agitation in Congress and out of it, with a view to the overthrow of an institution over which the States maintaining it, had exclusive control—as injurious as it was insulting to the South.

The Mexican war broke out—the subject of slavery was thrust into that question by the North—the war terminated in the acquisition of Territories, and the North proceeded in their threatened design to exclude therefrom the Southern people. Its policy was not the offspring of a mere lust of power, but of a determination to effect the abolition of slavery in the States. The Southern States through their Legislatures protested, but the North abating none of her pretensions, a Convention became necessary.

In what condition has the agitation placed the Southern States? In Congress their Representatives are insulted and reviled—that body is little better than a grand instrument in the hands of the Abolitionists. In the North, instead of respect and sympathy, they meet with denunciation and hostility. In the Union, the attempt is made to arrest from them their common property and put upon them the brand of inferiority. And the worst feature of their condition is that it is progressive. Yield now to the demands of the North, and all is lost. In fifty years, twenty new non-slaveholding States will be added to the Union, whilst many now slaveholding will join them. The non-slaveholding States will then have the power by two-thirds of Congress and three-fourths of the States to amend the Constitution, and consummate their policy.

The North has been emboldened by the forbearance and non-action of the South, until "a sectional despotism, totally irresponsible to the People of the South, constituted of Representatives in Congress from non-slaveholding States, ignorant of Southern feelings, conditions, and institutions, reigns at Washington!"

Where the institutions and interests of two nations are identical, one may be safely subject to the other. But, slavery makes the Southern, a peculiar people, with interests and institutions different from those of the Northern People, and hence the vital necessity of independence in relation to their internal concerns. They must rule themselves or perish.

The North will not recognize the inferiority of the African to the Caucasian race, or the impossibility of amalgamation between the two races. Its sympathies naturally are not with the South; and its dogma—the absolute right of a majority to govern—prostrates every check upon popular passions. Its faithlessness to the compact of Union is not surprising—it is only another complication of the frailty and fallibility of our nature.

Hence, there is no safety for the South in submission. Being in the minority, it must protect itself and preserve the Constitution. But how? Not by the ordinary measures of the Government. Nor by changing its Representatives, for how can that affect the majority? Not by the ballot-box—that is powerless in the South. It cannot send a majority of Southern Representatives to Congress. In fact, the majority against the South in the present Congress is greater than ever; while in the Northern States no indications are afforded of a reviving repulse for the Constitution.

The Address points to no mode by which the South can protect itself and preserve the Constitution. All ordinary means, it pronounces worthless—the extraordinary means it does not designate, but leaves to be inferred.

It then proceeds to examine the scheme of adjustment or compromise reported by the Committee of Thirteen in the Senate; and it objects to it, first, that it proposes to exclude the South from the whole of California, which by its Constitution has prohibited slavery. This Constitution was the work of individuals, not a people, and if Congress sanction it, it only enacts the Wilnot Provision in another form. It is enough that the outrage is committed—the form is of no consequence. There is nothing in this mode of extending the Provision to abate the indignation of the South, or to baffle its determination to redress the wrong.

In the second place, the scheme takes Texas enough territory for two large States, and transfers it to the non-slaveholding States. Texas ought to be the accession of two free States. Texas ought to be quieted as to her boundaries, but this should be done by a law of Congress recognizing them. The transfer proposed to be made, if the bill be carried, will place a tier of free States on the western boundary of the Indian country, now slaveholding, and on the northern and western frontiers of Texas. Thus the Southern States will be hemmed in.

In the third place, it objects to the proposed abolition of the slave trade in the District. If Congress may declare free a slave, imported into the District, it may declare free, those already in it.

Fourthly, as to the fugitive bill, it proposes means entirely inefficient to the end, and is insulting to the South in providing for a jury trial for the slave in the State where he may have escaped.

For these reasons, the Address intimates that the Missouri line of 36° 30' extended to the Pacific, with the express recognition of the right to hold slaves below that line, would not be unacceptable.

The South, in our opinion, might accept one other compromise, not because it is co-extensive with the Missouri compromise, but because it has been sanctioned by those who have gone before us. If the North offers the Missouri compromise, to extend to the Pacific ocean, the South cannot reject it, provided a distinct recognition of our right to enter the territory south of 36° 30' north latitude is expressed in the compromise. We should take this line as a partition line between the two sections of the Union; and, besides this, nothing but what the Constitution bestows, although the Northern States would acquire by this compromise three-fourths of our vacant territory, they will have renounced the inalienable pretension of restricting and preventing the extension of the South, whilst they should extend indefinitely.

The Address closes with the announcement of the purpose to meet six weeks after the adjournment of Congress, to consider what then may be necessary to be done.

We have thus presented an abstract of a document which will hardly produce the impression throughout the country contemplated by its authors. It is hard to believe that they are sincere.

and aggressiveness of the Northern States, and the danger to be apprehended to Slavery from their usurpations of political power. Look at every Department of the Federal Government; is it not under the complete control of slaveholders? The Chief Executive, a slaveholder, the Chief Justice, a slaveholder, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, a slaveholder, the chairman of all the important committees in both Houses of Congress, slaveholders, their dependents, in a word, the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Departments of the Government under the domination of slaveholders! And yet the North is a fierce, an unrelenting, overbearing Despotism, under which the South groans, in danger of being crushed to powder!

In view of such facts, to charge the North with being despotic and aggressive, indicates astounding infatuation, or rank dishonesty. How is this Despotism constituted? The South has generally furnished our Presidents—always a majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court—for the last twenty-five years the Speakers of the House of Representatives, with two exceptions; and in the Senate it possesses an equality of votes. Where then is the despotism? Note the language of the Address:

"A Sectional Despotism, totally irresponsible to the People of the South—constituted of Representatives in Congress of the non-slaveholding States—ignorant of our feelings, condition, and institutions—reigns at Washington!"

That is, the free People of the non-slaveholding States, numbering twice as many as the free People of the slaveholding States, have a majority in the House of Representatives of thirty-nine, and these non-slaveholding Representatives are responsible to their constituents, "totally irresponsible to the People of the South!" That is, that is the irresponsible Despotism under which the South is degraded. On an equal ratio of representation, it cannot cost so many votes as the North! Grievance unutterable! How can such an aggression on the part of the North be pardoned? True, we do not suffer much from this irresponsible Despotism. We can generally bribe, divide, or outwit the majority. We control, of course, the organization of the House—we shape the Committees to our liking—we bring forward what measures we please—and, if we cannot carry them through, we can block all legislation. Besides, we hold a veto power, first in the Senate, next in the Chief Executive, and a revisionary power ultimately in the Judiciary. Still, until the six millions of Southern freemen can cast as many votes in the House of Representatives as the twelve millions of Northern freemen, or the representatives of the latter be clear in the distant vision that the South is in subjection to an intolerable, detestable Sectional Despotism!

We wish the Nashville patriots a speedy deliverance from their lamentable hallucination.

THE TARIFF AND THE COMPROMISE.

We have already adverted to the efforts made to enlist the Manufacturing Interests of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts in favor of the Compromise bill. That private assurances have been given of a modification of the Tariff, if those interests would assent to the demands of the slaveholders respecting the Territories, we have no doubt. It will be recollected that Mr. Clay, presenting a memorial from Pennsylvania praying an increase of duties on iron, plainly told the memorialists that nothing could be done for them till the question now agitating the country should be adjusted; and Mr. Webster takes particular pains to impress upon the Lowell capitalists that no business of general importance can be transacted, till the agitation of the Slavery Question in Congress be terminated; and his mode of terminating it, by concession to the slaveholders. It would seem that the deputations lately in Massachusetts, to ascertain whether there was any hope of obtaining protection, under the conditions, that their object could be obtained except on conditions. What they were may be inferred from the character of the letters addressed to Mr. Webster for the purpose of sustaining him in his position.

What is to be thought of these things? Men who make haste to be rich will risk their souls for gold. Mammon is as potent now as it was eighteen hundred years ago when Judas sold his Lord for thirty pieces of silver. Who cares how many slaves shall clank their chains in our free Territories, so that Monopoly may grow fat on its extortions from the million?

But, if there be manufacturing capitalists, so sordid as to be contemplating an arrangement by which they are to receive additional protection for their factories, on condition of their betraying the cause of Human Freedom, we ask them to attend to the Washington Union, the great champion of the Compromise bill. That paper denounces their complaints of hard times and low prices—denounces them as hypocritical panic-makers—and hints at the policy of reducing rates by augmenting the Tariff.

"A few days since," it says, "in order to show the unfounded character of the representations of distress put forth by the Northern manufacturers, we cited the fact that new factories were rising up in the South, and that, in that section of the Union, those engaged in the cotton manufacture were doing a good business. The intelligence was followed by the last arrival from Europe exhibiting the same state of things in the manufacturing districts of England. Now, with these evidences of the prosperity of the cotton manufacturing interest in every district and country in the world, except New England, before our eyes, we respectfully inquire, how it happens that the mammoth corporations of Lowell, and other manufacturing towns of New England, should be in such a state of suffering and distress? The answer is obvious: it is untrue that they are. It is a shallow and miserable device, invented to enable them to get an increase of duties, in order that their profits may be swollen to an amount which no other business can hope to obtain. It is a gross attempt to impose upon the people and upon Congress, and, instead of being rewarded by an increase of duties, it should be met with a reduction. We have no doubt a much larger revenue could be derived from the tariff of duties on cotton goods, if they were reduced to duty than is now derived from them. Thus would the people obtain more cloth for the same money, and the Treasury would derive more revenue. Certainly, if the manufacturers would expect favor from Congress, they should come before that body with the truth, instead of a lie, in their mouths. We advise them to reflect that 'honesty is the best policy,' and that they will gain nothing by such a sham, and will only expose themselves to the intelligence of the country."

If any arrangement has been made by which an increased Tariff has been pledged on condition of support to the Compromise, the Tariff men will be inevitably cheated. This is our prediction. The expectation that the Senate will con-

sent to any such modifications of the Tariff as are desired, can be entertained by no one who understands anything of the composition of that body. It contains a most decided anti-Tariff majority, as all bargainers will find.

A SABBATH SCENE.

Scarcely had the solemn Sabbath bell
Ceased quivering in the temple,
Scarcely had the parson to his desk
Walked stately through his people—
When down the summer shaded street
A wasted female figure,
With downcast brow and averted face,
Came rushing wild and eager.

She saw the white spire through the trees,
She heard the sweet hymn swelling;
Oh, playing Christ! a refuge give!
That poor one in Thy dwelling!

Like a snail from before the bound,
Right up the steeple she climbed,
What a cheer behind her, whip in hand,
A lank haired hunter started.

She raised a keen and bitter cry,
To Heaven and Earth appealing:
Were manhood's generous pulses dead?
Had woman's heart no feeling?

A score of stout hands rose between
The hunter and the fugitive,
Flashed light, yet defying,
"Who dares profane this house and day?"

Cried out the angry pastor.
"Why, bless your soul, the wench's a slave,
And I'm her lord and master!"

"I've laid and gospel on my side,
And who shall dare refuse me!"
Down came the parson, bearing law,
"My good sir, pray cease!"

"Of course I know your right divine
To own and work and whip her;
Quick, deacon, throw that Polygott!
Before the wench, and trip her!"

Pump dropped the holy tome, and over
His sacred pages stumbled.
He dashed head and feet, for a slave once more
The hapless wretch lay trembling.

I saw the parson tie the knots,
The while his flock addressing,
The Scriptural claims of slavery
With text on text impressing.

"Although," said he, "on Sabbath day,
All secular occupations
Are sinful, with knotted hands to fulfil
Our good sir, pray cease!"

"To every conscience tender;
As Paul sent back Onesimus,
My Christian friends, we send her!"
Shriek rose on shriek; the Sabbath air
Her wild cries tore asunder;

And, shrieking, with knotted hands to hear
God's word, she came to the door,
And, dashing, the very altar's cloth
Had smothered down her shrieking.

And, dumb, she turned from face to face,
For human pity seeking;
I saw her dragged along the aisle,
Her shackles harshly clanking;

I heard the parson, with a stern, still air,
The Lord's devoutly thanking;
My brain took fire; "I'm preaching!" I cried,
"The end of prayer is this!"

Then down with pulpit, then with priest,
And give us Nature's teaching!
"Foul shame and scorn be on ye all
Who turn the good to evil,
And send the Bible forth from Lord,
To give it to the Devil!"

That garbled text or parchment law
I own a statute higher,
And God is true, though every book
And every man's a liar!"

Just then I felt the deacon's hand
In wrath my coat-tail seize;
I heard the priest cry, "Infernal!"
The larger matter, 'Twas said!

I saw the parson, with a stern, still air,
The Lord's devoutly thanking;
My brain took fire; "I'm preaching!" I cried,
"The end of prayer is this!"

Then down with pulpit, then with priest,
And give us Nature's teaching!
"Foul shame and scorn be on ye all
Who turn the good to evil,
And send the Bible forth from Lord,
To give it to the Devil!"

That garbled text or parchment law
I own a statute higher,
And God is true, though every book
And every man's a liar!"

Just then I felt the deacon's hand
In wrath my coat-tail seize;
I heard the priest cry, "Infernal!"
The larger matter, 'Twas said!

view" and "The Friend," aided in remonstrating against the repeal of the law. The "Friends' Weekly Intelligencer," the organ of that division of Friends who are commonly called Abolitionists, (from the name of that uncompromising and earnestly. The editor says, that there is perhaps no body of people more unitedly opposed to the course of Daniel Webster, on the slave question, than the Society of Friends, and "none who more sincerely regret the apostasy of this eminent statesman, at a time when his talents and influence might have been favorably exerted in the cause of liberty and humanity."

We had intended to offer some comments upon other portions of the Newburyport letter, which we quite agree with General Cass in "one of the most remarkable documents of the time," but the able review of Horace Mann has rendered them unnecessary. J. G. W.

THE BLACK LAW OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

The subject of the imprisonment of colored seamen in the port of Charleston has been brought before the attention of the English Government, by a recent suit, in the Thames Police Court, on the part of the steward of a British bark, for his wages, payment of which the master of the bark refused, on the ground that the vessel was detained by the seizure of the crew for two months in the common jail at Charleston. The master stated that the steward, a respectable British subject, was taken out of his vessel, by the constables of Charleston, and dragged to the jail, from whence he would have been sold as a slave had not he (the master) paid \$100 expenses.

Lord Palmerston, when questioned in respect to the matter in Parliament, stated that, in 1847, her Majesty's Government had directed the British Minister at Washington to remonstrate against the imprisonment of British seamen, and the violation of the British flag, but that Mr. Buchanan had verbally replied that the Federal Government could not assent to the Legislature of South Carolina to repeal the law, and if pressed on the ground of the treaty of 1815, under which all subjects and citizens of the two countries were to be permitted freely to enter, freely reside in, and freely quit the territories of each, would be compelled to put an end to that treaty, by giving the twelve months' notice required for that purpose.

"Ship said that it had then been deemed undesirable to press the matter to such an extremity. The outrage was spoken of by the member who called Lord P.'s attention to it, as a scandalous violation of the principles which regulated the intercourse of civilized nations." Lord Palmerston said that the law grew out of the unfortunate institution of slavery; and it was quite unnecessary for him to express the opinion which all who heard him must entertain with respect to it.

The matter will not, we think, end here. A case similar to the one under consideration was brought to the attention of Lord Aberdeen, when Foreign Minister; and, from the correspondence which followed, it was understood that in future the personal freedom of British subjects secured by the treaty of 1815 would be respected in American ports. In the case of two colored British subjects from the Bahamas, who were there seized and imprisoned some years ago, their jail fees not being paid, they were sold as slaves. A formal demand for their release was made by the British Government—one of them was found and restored, the other could not be discovered.

The London Anti-Slavery Reporter of the last volume calls upon the British press and public to demand from Government immediate measures to prevent future outrages of this kind. "We do not," say the editors, "intend that this case shall pass over lightly; it is too important to be shuffled out of sight, to suit the convenience of any parties; and the question must receive a definitive answer, whether the colored population belonging to this country and its various dependencies are to be treated as felons and slaves in any ports of the United States; and whether the British Government is unable or unwilling to protect them, when going thither on their lawful business?"

As Massachusetts and the free States generally have a stake in this controversy in common with Great Britain, we shall look with some degree of interest for its result. J. G. W.

TEXAS AND NEW MEXICO.

The President last week transmitted to the Senate the following message:

WASHINGTON, June 17, 1850.
To the Senate of the United States:
I have received a copy of a resolution of the Senate of the 11th June instant, requesting me "to inform the Senate whether any orders have been issued to any military officer or officers at Santa Fe, to hold possession against the authority of Texas, or in any way to embarrass or prevent the exercise of her jurisdiction over that country; and to furnish the Senate with copies of any correspondence which may have taken place between the War Department and the military stationed at Santa Fe since the date of my last communication to the Senate on that subject."

In reply to that resolution, I state that no such orders have been given. I herewith present to the Senate a copy of the correspondence referred to in the resolution. All the other orders relating to the subject matter of the resolution have been heretofore communicated to the Senate.

I have already, in a former message, referred to the fact that the boundary between Texas and New Mexico is disputed. I have now to state that information has been recently received, that a certain Robert S. Neighbors, styling himself Commissioner of Texas, has proceeded to Santa Fe with a view of organizing himself in that district under the authority of Texas. While I have no power to decide the question of boundary, and no desire to interfere with the possession of territory until the question of boundary shall have been determined by some competent authority. Meanwhile, I think there is no reason for seriously apprehending that Texas will practically interfere with the possession of the United States.

As we read this, the President denies the authority of Texas over New Mexico. The inquiry was, whether orders had been issued to United States officers "to hold possession of the country against the authority of Texas." The answer is, that "no such orders have been given," but that the possession of the territory into which it appears Mr. Neighbors has thus gone, was actually acquired by the United States from Mexico, has since been held by the United States, and ought still to be so held till the question of boundary be determined by the competent authority. The presumption is, then, that orders were issued to the United States officers, in command in New Mexico, to hold possession of the country thus acquired, not "against the authority of Texas," because Texas had no authority over it.

With this construction of the message, we do not understand why a certain Robert S. Neighbors, styling himself Commissioner of the State of Texas, was permitted to usurp jurisdiction over a Territory, the possession of which had been acquired by the United States from Mexico, and held ever since that event, and which ought in the opinion of the President, so to remain. How could he, as the Chief Executive of the United States, permit to maintain unimpaired their rights, bound Major Neighbors, styling himself a Commissioner of Texas, to oust them from their possession by force? For certainly, the organization of New Mexico into districts of Texas, and the extension of the jurisdiction of the latter over it, involved a forcible exclusion of United States authority and possession.

We confess we are unable to understand clearly the exact position of the Executive towards New Mexico. After the advent of Major Neighbors, it seemed as if his proceedings by which the United States were to be ejected from the possession of New Mexico, received the countenance of the officers of the United States, in the Territory, acting under orders from the Administration. Nothing could be more inexcusable. It appeared like a cowardly betrayal of trust.

Later intelligence shows that either the orders of the Executive were at first misunderstood, or that subsequent orders were issued, more in consonance with the dignity and rights of the United States. From a note addressed by Mr. Neighbors to Col. J. Munroe, United States Military Commander at Santa Fe, dated April 15th, it seems that public notice had been given, of a meeting of the citizens of that place, "to take into consideration the propriety of making a State movement, and to petition you (the Colonel) as the head of this Government, to call a Convention," &c. Mr. Neighbors deemed it proper under the circumstances to enter the following protest, addressed to the military commander.

I deem it the more necessary so solemnly to protest against any countenance or aid being given to this movement by the present head of this Government, in consequence of the published orders which have emanated from the War Department, and the result of an interview had between us a few days since. The Government which I have the honor to represent has declared her determination to maintain inviolate all the territory within her boundaries—such boundaries were guaranteed to her by her compact of union; and I would take this opportunity to refer you to the 23rd section of the "Joint Resolution for annexing Texas to the United States," and preamble of the Constitution of the State of Texas, by which the terms of said "Joint Resolution" are accepted. I deem it the more necessary so solemnly to protest against any countenance or aid being given to this movement by the present head of this Government, in consequence of the published orders which have emanated from the War Department, and the result of an interview had between us a few days since. The Government which I have the honor to represent has declared her determination to maintain inviolate all the territory within her boundaries—such boundaries were guaranteed to her by her compact of union; and I would take this opportunity to refer you to the 23rd section of the "Joint Resolution for annexing Texas to the United States," and preamble of the Constitution of the State of Texas, by which the terms of said "Joint Resolution" are accepted.

ROBERT S. NEIGHBORS,
Commissioner of the State of Texas.

To Col. J. Munroe,
Commanding 9th Military Division, &c.

The following despatch from New Orleans, published in the *New York Tribune*, shows that his protest was unheeded—Col. Munroe issued a call for a State Convention.

CONVENTION TO FORM A STATE GOVERNMENT.
NEW ORLEANS, Monday, June 17, 1850.

The *Galveston (Texas) Centinel* of the 14th inst. contains a proclamation by Col. Munroe, the United States Military Governor in New Mexico, directing the election of Delegates to a convention, to be held at Santa Fe, to organize a State Constitution and Government for the Territory.

The Convention was to be held at Santa Fe on the 10th ult. Major Neighbors, the Texas Commissioner in New Mexico, has returned to Austin after ineffectual efforts to organize the country of Santa Fe.

The cause of his failure was the interference of the Military authorities at Santa Fe. It is stated that Col. Munroe acted in pursuance of fresher orders from Washington, but this is doubtful. At all events, the call for a State Convention is a most important step—a step which if sooner taken might have prevented a world of difficulty.

The influence of this movement on the deliberations of Congress and the fate of the Compromise bill must be of a very decided character. The organization of a State Government would doubtless meet with the approbation of the Executive and the application of the new State for admission would give great additional weight to what is called the President's plan.

We await further developments.

SENATOR DICKINSON.—The Hunkers of New York city lately gave a dinner to Senator Dickinson: there was any amount of talk and toasts about conciliation, harmony, compromise, and all that. One toast was admirable—all can drink it.

Union and Harmony in the Democratic Party.—Desirable, if founded on principle—detestable, if only dictated by expediency.

If the former kind of union be perfected, Daniel and his friends will find themselves "outsiders."

NATIONAL FREE SOIL CONVENTION.—The *New York Evening Post* publishes a call for "A Grand National Free Soil Convention" in favor of Free Soil, to be held at Philadelphia, July 4th. Some of our friends had been contemplating a similar Convention, at a somewhat later date; but this call seems to anticipate them.

FREE SOIL, FREEMAN, LIBERTY AND UNION!
1776, 1787, 1850!